



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/531,055

04/12/2005

Norman Howard Cohen

DE920020021US1

4554

32329 7590 06/20/2008

IBM CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
11400 BURNET ROAD
AUSTIN, TX 78758

EXAMINER

PARK, JEONG S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2154

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/20/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/531,055	Applicant(s) COHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner JEONG S. PARK	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/12/2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 13-16, 18-22 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 13-16, 18-22 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 4/12/2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/12/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1-9, 11, 13-16, 18-22 and 24 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1, line 6, the phrase “a disconnected Portal” should be corrected as –said disconnected Portal-- for clear understanding of the claim;

In claim 1, line 13, the phrase “said disconnected Mobile Portal” should be corrected as –said disconnected Portal-- in order to consistent with the stated terminology;

In claim 1, line 16, the phrase “a Synchronized Engine” should be corrected as –said Synchronized Engine-- for clear understanding of the claim. Similar correction should be made for claim 13;

In claim 8, line 1, the word “server” should be corrected as –the server-- for clear understanding of the claim;

In claim 18, line 1, the word “method” should be corrected as –a method-- for clear understanding of the claim; and

In claim 19, line 1, the word “method” should be corrected as –the method-- for clear understanding of the claim. Similar correction should be made for claims 20-22 and 24.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 2-5, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fischer et al. (hereinafter Fischer)(U.S. Patent No. 7,162,543 B2).

Regarding claim 1, Fischer teaches as follows:

a server system having a Portal server (server 190 in figure 1) and a communication link to Mobile Devices (mobile device 110 in figure 1) having a disconnected Portal (web server 115 in figure 1, see, e.g., col. 3, lines 17-33), a Deployment Registry (registry 175 in figure 1, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 16-26), and a Synchronization Engine (synchronization layer 185 in figure 1, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 27-43), wherein said Portal server (server 190 in figure 1 and 200 in figure 4) is characterized by the further components:

a Topology Manager (deployment console 400 in figure 6 resides on the server, see, e.g., col. 9, lines 22-25) which provides means to automatically create a Mobile Device specific content topology for a disconnected Portal at said Server system (deployment console has an overview of all installed offline application functions per user and device, see, e.g., col. 9, line 22 to col. 10, line 22);

a Dynamic Information Manager (registry service 175 in figure 1) which provides means to access dynamic information and to provide said dynamic information to said Topology Manager (deployment console 400 in figure 6) in order to adapt an existing user-defined connected content topology to a Mobile Device specific environment resulting in a Mobile Device specific content topology (information from the registry is provided to the deployment console during a synchronization and used by the deployment console to make sure that mobile devices outfitted as it should be, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 16-26);

a Migration Manager (installer 430 in figure 6) which provides means to package said Mobile Device specific content topology for said disconnected Mobile Portal including disconnected Portlet applications assigned to said Device specific content topology, and the Portlet data to be rendered by said disconnected Portlet applications (the installer provides software and installation on a device based on comparison of information from a registry service on a device to information resident on that particular device, see, e.g., col. 10, lines 5-22); and

a Synchronization Engine (synchronization RFC 210 in figure 3, see, e.g., col. 6, lines 54-58) to synchronize the data between said server and said Mobile Device (synchronization layer controls the synchronization of data on mobile device with computer system, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 27-43).

Regarding claims 2-4, Fischer teaches as follows:

wherein said Topology Manager (deployment console 400 in figure 6) has access to user-disconnected profile Database (storage media 436 in figure 6), wherein each

Art Unit: 2146

user-disconnected profile is defined by a user profile identification, a selected target Mobile Device, selected disconnected Portlet applications to be used by the disconnected target Mobile Portal, and the associated dynamic information (see, e.g., col. 9, line 22 to col. 10, line 23); and

GUI is well-known in the art to be utilized in any computerized communications.

Regarding claim 5, Fischer teaches as follows:

wherein said Dynamic Information Manager (registry service 175 in figure 1) has access to a Database which stores the dynamic information (local database access 170 in figure 1 is provided to permit access to database 180 in figure 1, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 5-6).

Regarding claim 13, Fischer teaches as follows:

a Mobile Device (110 in figure 1) is characterized by the further components:

a disconnected Portal framework and disconnected Portlets being provided by said server (web server 115 in figure 1, see, e.g., col. 3, lines 17-33);

a Deployment Registry for deploying and registering the disconnected Portlets being provided by said Portal server (registry 175 in figure 1, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 16-26); and

a Synchronization Engine for receiving the disconnected Portlet applications and Mobile Device specific content topology and for sending and receiving the data to be rendered by said Portlet applications (synchronization layer 185 in figure 1, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 27-43).

Regarding claim 14, Fischer teaches as follows:

a Database for storing the Mobile Device specific content topology and the data to be rendered by said Portlet applications (database 180 in figure 1, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 5-16); and

a Migration Manager (registry service 175 in figure 1) for keeping track of the changes between said Mobile Device and said Server System and triggering the synchronization (registry service maintains a list of all installed offline application and provides to the deployment console during a synchronization, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 16-26).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer et al. (hereinafter Fischer)(U.S. Patent No. 7,162,543 B2).

Regarding claim 16, Fischer teaches all the limitations of claim as presented above per claim 13.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Fischer to include a disconnected Portal servlet, an embedded aggregator, and an embedded Portlet container.

6. Claims 6-9, 11, 15, 18-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer et al. (hereinafter Fischer)(U.S. Patent No. 7,162,543 B2) and further in view of Pessi et al. (hereinafter Pessi)(U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0083291 A1).

Regarding claims 6-8, Fischer teaches all the limitations of claim except for the specific dynamic information provided by the mobile device.

Pessi teaches as follows:

terminal related information (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0014]) and other capability descriptors (see, e.g., page 7, paragraph [0068]);

Topology Manager creates a Mobile Device specific content topology at the server side by using the information defined by said user-defined disconnected profile (SIP proxy adapts the message to meet the terminal's capabilities and user's preference using the stored CPI (see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0045] and figure 2); and

information specified by said user-defined disconnected profile is sent to said Mobile Device in a single file (transferring the adapted message to the terminal, see, e.g., 220 in figure 2 and page 5 ,paragraph [0045]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Fischer with Pessi to include specific dynamic information for efficient synchronization between the mobile device and the server.

Regarding claim 9, Fischer teaches as follows:

Migration Manager creates a XML file including said Mobile Device specific content topology, a WAR file for said disconnected Portlet applications with their deployment descriptors, and said Portlet data to be rendered by said disconnected

Portlets (various different programming models, see, e.g., col. 3, line 50 to col. 4, line 21).

Regarding claims 11 and 15, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to switch between the offline and the online applications by the mobile device.

Regarding claim 18, Fischer teaches as follows:

initiating a switch at the server side from a connected to a disconnected mode between said Portal Server and said Mobile Device (initiate sync 230 in figure 5, see, e.g., col. 7, lines 60-67); and

selecting available disconnected Portlet applications to be replicated to said Mobile Device (installer 430 in figure 6 retrieve software from storage media for downloading and installation on the mobile device, e.g., col. 10, lines 5-14).

Fischer does not teach the content adaptation based on the device profile information.

Pessi teaches as follows:

a method for creating a Mobile Device specific content topology at a Portal Server (SIP proxy adapts the message to meet the terminal's capabilities and user's preference using the stored CPI, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0045] and figure 2), comprising the steps of;

creating a Mobile Device specific content topology based on an existing user-defined connected content topology including said selected disconnected Portlet applications and dynamic information about channel capabilities, said Mobile Device

capabilities, and location information of said target Mobile Device (terminal related information, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0014] and other capability descriptors, see, e.g., page 7, paragraph [0068]);

packaging said Mobile Device specific content topology including said selected disconnected Portlet applications assigned to it and said data to be rendered by selected Portlet application (see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0041]); and

transferring said Mobile Device specific content topology including said selected disconnected Portlet applications assigned to it, and said data to be rendered by said selected Portlet application to said Mobile Device (transferring the adapted message to the terminal, see, e.g., 220 in figure 2 and page 5 ,paragraph [0045]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Fischer with Pessi in order to efficiently synchronize the display of the requested content on the mobile device based on the specific mobile device's profile.

Regarding claim 19, Fischer teaches that said disconnected mode (offline operation) is accomplished by a disconnection Portlet (see, e.g., col. 3, lines 34-49).

Regarding claim 20, Fischer teaches that said disconnection Portlet is added by default to all Portal pages (web server, see, e.g., col. 3, lines 34-49).

Regarding claim 21, Fischer teaches that said disconnection Portlet presents a graphical user interface allowing a user to select the Portlet application to be replicated and the target Mobile Device (the installer provides software and installation on a device

based on comparison of information from a registry service on a device to information resident on that particular device, see, e.g., col. 10, lines 5-22).

Regarding claim 22, Fischer teaches as follows:

determining the availability of said selected disconnected Portlet applications for the target Mobile Device, removing non-available Portlet applications from said existing user-defined connected content topology (the installer provides software and installation on a device based on comparison of information from a registry service on a device to information resident on that particular device, see, e.g., col. 10, lines 5-22).

Regarding claim 24, Fischer teaches as follows:

each change of the data belonging to the Mobile Device specific content topology stored at the server side or at the Mobile Device side is synchronized during the connected mode (synchronization of data on mobile device with computer system once the mobile device achieves connection through the Internet, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 26-43).

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEONG S. PARK whose telephone number is (571)270-1597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:00 - 3:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2146

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. S. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2154

June 18, 2008

/Joseph E. Avellino/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2146